

## REMARKS

Claims 10 – 18 remain in the application. All of the claims stand rejected on exactly the same grounds presented in the prior non-final office action. Claims 10 - 17 are rejected under Section 103 based on Eryurek (US 2003/0045962) in view of Sainen (U.S. 5,034,897). Claim 18 is rejected under Section 103 based on Eryurek (US 2003/0045962) in view of Sainen (U.S. 5,034,897) and Lewis (US 5,281,343). Applicants have reviewed the Examiner's Response to Arguments at page 7 of the final office action and again request reconsideration of the rejection of claim 10 over Eryurek in view of Sainen. That rejection is traversed for at least the following reasons.

Claim 10 requires “determining a minimum control reserve of a plurality of control loops of the installation on the basis of the recorded process variables ...” The office action (see page 8) refers to dead time in the control system of Eryurek which is more fully explained at par [0009] of the reference as a delay, which makes it difficult to control product quality, due to the disparate locations of sensors and actuators, it being understood that this refers to a time delay in sensing because the sensor position is downstream of the actuator position. For this reason the control system cannot tolerate high gain in the control loop. Control loop gain has nothing to do with “determining a minimum control reserve” and the rejection incorrectly equates a “high gain” in a control loop with increasing the capacity of a system. There is absolutely no basis on which to make this argument. Furthermore, it must be noted that the reference states that a high gain cannot be tolerated. Based on the Examiner's interpretation of “high gain” this would mean that a system could not (i.e., never) incur a “high” increase in capacity, which appears to be an absurd conclusion.

Claim 10 further requires “determining actions that increase the capacity of the installation, where the determined actions are based on the determined minimum control reserves ...” It is not clear, but it appears that the Sainen reference alone is relied upon at Col. 4, lines 34 et seq. and at col. 6, lines 60 et seq. for meeting this recitation. Applicants disagree because the citation at col. 4 states that a loom control method controls the loom on the basis of data representing, among other factors, the operating rate of the loom. Contrary to the argument used in the rejection, this prior art does not disclose “determining actions that increase the capacity of the installation ...” The citation does not discuss any actions that increase the capacity of the installation. Rather, at best, the reference suggests modifying the operating rate of a loom, but

makes no reference to determining actions - based on a "determined minimum control reserve" that increase the capacity. It is not understood how the Examiner relates the recited subject matter with use of feedback in a control loop. The rejection is in error. It is incumbent on the Examiner to fully support the position relied upon or to withdraw the rejection. Furthermore, notwithstanding such argument, there is still no disclosure of a minimum control reserve.

Conclusion

For the foregoing reasons, it is respectfully submitted that the rejections set forth in the outstanding Office Action are inapplicable. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner remove the rejections and timely pass the application to allowance. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our below-listed address. Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this paper. The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any appropriate fees due in connection with this paper, including fees for additional claims and terminal disclaimer fee, or credit any overpayments to Deposit Account No. 19-2179.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated:

May 11, 2010

By:

Janet D. Hood

Janet D. Hood  
Registration No. 61,142  
(407) 736-6449

Siemens Corporation  
Intellectual Property Department  
170 Wood Avenue South  
Iselin, New Jersey 08830